1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. KLAYMAN: Larry Klayman for Judge Roy Moore. Good to meet you, your Honor.

MS. McNAMARA: Elizabeth McNamara for the defendants Sasha Baron Cohen, Showtime Networks and CBS, and this is Rachel Strom, my partner, who is with me.

THE COURT: Good morning.

We are here for a premotion conference. This is the first time this matter has been on in front of me.

I have seen the parties' submissions. It seems to me that it makes sense to set a briefing schedule for the plaintiffs' motion to stay, as well as the defendants' 12(b)(6) motion.

Before we do that, I didn't see on the docket anywhere a copy of this standard consent agreement. Do counsel have that with them today, by any chance?

MS. McNAMARA: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Can you hand that to my deputy.

MS. McNAMARA: Absolutely. Thankfully, I didn't write on it.

MR. KLAYMAN: May I have a copy of it?

MS. McNAMARA: I only have one copy. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Thanks. Hold on a second.

I'll hand this back to counsel. There is something in this agreement that was highlighted and crossed out. Was that

something that was done prior to the signing of the agreement or was that something done by counsel afterwards?

MS. McNAMARA: Your Honor, the yellow highlighting, I believe, was by counsel. But the handwritten cross-out and initial was done at the time of execution.

Your Honor, may I interject just a brief administrative matter?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. McNAMARA: This is our first appearance before your Honor, as you've already noted. The plaintiffs' counsel is not a New York bar, member of the New York bar, and has not submitted *pro hac* papers. I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the Court.

MR. KLAYMAN: I wanted to address that, your Honor, if I may.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. KLAYMAN: I never appeared in front of you. It's a pleasure.

I have consulted with Judge Moore, and we have decided not to pursue the mandamus in DC and to proceed in front of your Honor. I will be submitting the *pro hac vice* application later today. I've been a member in good standing of the District of Columbia and Florida bars for 39 and 42 years respectively.

There was one issue that came up 23 years ago with

Judge Chin, 23 years, where I had an issue with him, and he required that I provide to the Court, if I ever sought pro hac vice entry again, a copy of his order where he said I would no longer be able to come into his courtroom pro hac vice. I wanted to just advise you of that and use this as an opportunity.

Ms. Strom and Ms. McNamara, on behalf of their client, have consented to my pro hac vice entry, but I wanted to raise that because Judge Chin had ordered that I advise the Court in the future if I sought pro hac vice entry with you.

Obviously, we had hoped to proceed in DC. We are certainly confident of success, your Honor, in front of you. The fact that we sought DC has no reflection on the integrity or ability of this Court to adjudicate this issue. And we have submitted a letter pointing out how New York law actually is on point with our client's case.

THE COURT: Anything from defense's counsel on this?

MS. McNAMARA: No, your Honor. It is correct that we consented to his pro hac application, provided that Mr. Klayman complied with the local rules and the applicable orders under pro hac which would necessitate him to, in addition to providing your Honor with Judge Chin's decision, to apprise the Court of pending disciplinary action against him in DC.

MR. KLAYMAN: We will submit that in our application, your Honor.

2.3

There is no final decision. Those matters are on appeal. This is regrettable because if that's the case, it looks to me like she is consenting but yet saying something that would prejudice my application. That was unnecessary because I said I would submit it and I said I would set forth what's required to be set forth.

If that's the case, yes, I would like to seek a stay on the mandamus, if this is the way it's going to proceed. I thought we were going to move forward amicably to get a just resolution of these matters on the merits rather than to have counsel in any kind of issue with each other. I'm trying to be diplomatic.

THE COURT: Let's have plaintiffs' counsel file your pro hac vice application. Can you get that submitted within a week from today?

MR. KLAYMAN: I can, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's have that filed by August 8. Let's deal with that issue sort of first.

Let me find out, although I think I know the answer to this question, have there been any sort of settlement discussions at all between the parties?

MR. KLAYMAN: We are always open to settlement. I would hope that there would be. There not have been any settlement discussions.

THE COURT: Is there a reason for that? Is it just

2.3

that the parties haven't gotten around to that? There is no interest in that?

MR. KLAYMAN: I have an interest in that. We would like to settle the matter.

Your Honor, I'm sure, has read the various documents that have been submitted to you. Judge Moore has been, as we allege, see severely defamed, called a pedophile. That's very serious. And, yes, we would like to settle it. New York law is clear, as your Honor can read from our letter in what we set forth, that you can't release someone from an act which has yet to occur.

And we had several layers of fraud here. Yerushalayim TV is not Showtime, obviously. Judge Moore thought he was going to get an award from the State of Israel. Turns out that what he was getting was being branded a pedophile on national and international television. Even comedians are not immune from that kind of behavior.

We would like to settle this thing. We don't have an ax to grind. We just want to be made whole again, our client. I'm welcome to that and so is Judge Moore.

THE COURT: I take it from what you've said that you have not made a demand of the defendant?

MR. KLAYMAN: I have not.

THE COURT: Anything from defense counsel on this?

MS. McNAMARA: Thank you very much, your Honor.

2.3

We, of course, would listen to any demand made by the plaintiff. We would not foreclose that in any way. However, we do feel strongly, and there is strong principles at stake here in this litigation, and those are the underpinnings to our motion to dismiss that we would intend to file in the action.

Not only is it our position that it's strictly barred by the consent agreement, which your Honor just looked at, but it's squarely on point with the *Borat* decision that Judge Preska dismissed with the exact same release, the exact same waiver agreement, and the similar allegations of alleged fraud that was affirmed by the Second Circuit, and it's squarely on point.

So we don't think that this is a complicated issue, and it's an issue of some importance for my clients. This is Mr. Cohen's business in many regards, and it's one that's important to him, and we believe, even on the merits, that there simply is not a claim.

MR. KLAYMAN: Your Honor, the facts of this case are different, and you pointed it out yourself, in effect, when you asked Ms. McNamara to give you a copy of the release. Judge Moore crossed out anything dealing with sexual oriented or offensive behavior.

What's important is that the defendants signed this document. This was a fraud. They knew that they were going to go on and brand him as a pedophile, and they signed it knowing

J810000019-cv-04977-JPC Document 47 Filed 08/23/19 Page 8 of 9 1 that that was out of the release; consequently, a major fraud. 2 Plus, Yerushalayim TV is not Showtime, is not CBS. 3 On top of that, there is a pattern and practice here 4 with regard to this particular show, Who Is America, where they 5 did the same thing with other people but not to this degree. This case hinges on the merits. It doesn't have 6 7 anything to do with Borat. It has to do with Sasha Baron Cohen 8 and what he did Who is America. THE COURT: Let's do this. We have a date for 9 10 plaintiffs' counsel to file the pro hac vice application. 11 Let's get a date for a joint status report from the parties. 12 I encourage the parties to engage in some settlement 13 discussions. And in that status report you can let me know if 14 the case has settled, if the parties would like some help 15

I encourage the parties to engage in some settlement discussions. And in that status report you can let me know if the case has settled, if the parties would like some help settling the case. And, if not, we don't need to have another premotion conference. The parties can submit a proposed briefing schedule for the motion to dismiss and/or the motion for a stay, if that's still going to be pursued, and I'll sign off on that.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Let's do this, if both sides are willing to do this.

Let's have a brief discussion in the robing room off the record about potential settlement, if everyone is OK with that.

Does that work for plaintiffs' counsel?

MR. KLAYMAN: It does, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does that work for defense counsel?

1 MS. McNAMARA: Yes, your Honor, of course. 2 THE COURT: Let's go do that quickly in the robing 3 room. 4 (In the robing room; discussion off the record) 5 THE COURT: We had an off-the-record discussion about 6 settlement. I would encourage the parties to continue to 7 pursue settlement discussions. We have dates. Again, the pro hac vice application 8 9 will be filed by August 8 and a joint status report on August 10 In that status report let me know, again, if the parties 11 have settled or if the parties want me to refer this to a magistrate judge for settlement or to the Court's annexed 12 13 mediation program. If not, just give me a proposed briefing 14 schedule on the motion to stay and the motion to dismiss under 12(b)(6). 15 16 Anything else from plaintiffs' counsel today? 17 MR. KLAYMAN: No, your Honor. Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Anything else from defense counsel? 19 MS. McNAMARA: No, your Honor. Thank you very much. 20 THE COURT: We are adjourned. Thank you. 21 (Adjourned) 22 2.3 24

25